

Educational Policies Committee
Minutes September 24, 2020 respectfully submitted by Mary Ellen Wilkosz

Call to Order at 10:01 by E. Asencio

Emily requested that we move Anth 309 and Anth 340 to consent items because they were approved unanimously in all prior committees. Question was posed and no objections.

Approval of Agenda – with above modification/Approval of Minutes (9/10/2020) – approved by committee without modifications. Seeing no objection minutes approved.

Reports

1. Chair of EPC — E. Asencio

GE Subcommittee was asking about recertification process, GE subcommittee is asking specifically what are the changes for course moving from 4 unit to 3 unit course, questions came up if EPC wants this done, or do we leave this to the faculty to determine the appropriate content/work reduction. Emily posed the question of what we think.

K. Springmier: mentioned that this came up last year and discussed streamlining the process to make sure it meets the GE content criteria and not to evaluate the faculty's expertise in teaching a 3 vs 4 unit course.

Sheri Schonleber agrees, this makes sense to not evaluate content but the GE criteria meeting requirements.

Kristen Daley: agrees, Kristen reports teaching varying unit courses (1,2,3 unit) and understands the difference based on units. We should stick to the GE criteria.

Melinda Milligan: agrees with all and feels faculty able to reduce the work based on units.

Emily: Currently GE is asking for a side by side comparison of where the one unit is being reduced. Workload for both student and faculty should be going down. Question was asked if the process going from 3 to a 4-unit course should be used to justified, maybe similar criteria should be used in.

Melinda Milligan: states that the purview of EPC might be wanting to look at workload and number of units. Interesting thing for faculty to consider when teaching the course, but not a GE issue.

Luisa Grossi: 4 units in GE is an exception, general rule is 3 units for a GE course, so reducing may not need to be justified, where the 4 unit course being an exception requires justification.

Emily: Decision is that GE does not really need to address this but might be something for EPC to review.

Melissa: Might be good idea to keep it in the proposal as informational but not something that needs to be "demonstrated". Not something that needs to be addressed by EPC, this is a whole other level of review.

Emily: More of an explicit reminder about workload for faculty and student

2. AVP, Academic Programs — S. Bosick see below
3. Liaison to Graduate Studies Subcommittee- M. Wilkosz
no meeting last week, nothing to report
4. Liaison to GE Subcommittee —
5. Liaison to University Standards Subcommittee—Vacant
6. Liaison to/from APARC-

7. Liaison from Senate Diversity Subcommittee – (Occ. Report) –K. Daley missed the meeting never got zoom link, so no report.
8. **Liaison to GIG- Information Items**

Consent Items

1. Edec 160A/B, Phys 320, Phys 460, Anth 309 and Anth 340 (See Curriculog) – not discussed or approved at this meeting

Information Items

1.AB1460/CRS/Ethnic Studies Update lots of conversation around this issue.

Emily has placed a document in the google drive related to this. She has started to list some of the issues – in the AB1460/CRS/Ethnic Studies at SSU file. These are things we will need to consider as we move forward.

Main issues for SSU

FTE's go to Ethnic Studies only

Units for new Area F are expected to come out of Area D

Must be lower division courses

CRS overlay

Effect on courses in the pipeline for GE recertification that are affected by CRS/Ethnic Studies outcome- sunset date

Memo from SJSU senate to Statewide Senate, specific to their campus, similar memos from other CSUs, something to consider for SSU, would EPC originate such a memo for SSU. Emily is not able to find the memo sent out from the SSU senate last year related to Ethnic studies. Not sure what you are thinking and what EPC thinks are important.

Sheri: currently chair of SEIE committee. There have been concerns raised about the many ES course offered in the summer and the limited availability of ES courses in Fall and Spring, this has been an ongoing concern.

Melinda: What were the thoughts at EXCOM for EPC taking the lead on writing the memo. EXCOM would like EPC to draft memo and that Senate would support.

Emily: At the last EXCOM meeting I was able to provide info about the SJSU memo related to ES – I wanted to get the info out to them, even if just to review. She got the feeling that EXCOM wanted EPC to move forward with drafting a memo for SSU.

Kaitlin: Asked about all ES needing to be lower division courses according to the CO.

Stacey: EO has not yet been revised by the CO. Law does not designate courses must be lower division, CO is not requiring courses to be Lower Division, so SSU is going on the assumption that courses can be Upper or Lower division in area F. Comment made about the need to remember at what point a student is eligible to take upper division. It is important that SSU Ethnic studies be integrated and meet the pedagogical needs of University.

Stacey: Another stipulation from the CO is that all Ethnic studies course must have an Ethnic studies prefix. FTES need to go to Ethnic Studies which creates an intentions resource shift to ES. We have many faculty in other departments who teach ES so the question is how would this work at SSU.

Melinda: Asking if there is thinking on campus related to work arounds so that faculty outside of Ethnic Studies with this expertise could teach. What is the window that EO is expected?

Stacey: yes, mad brainstorming going on around the issue of "others" (non-ethnic studies faculty) teaching ES, because ES does not have resources to mount sufficient course to meet need.

Stacey is meeting with an expert who deal with interdisciplinary collaboration. Looking into how to buy out a faculty from another department to teach in ES so the FTES would still go to ES. This is the low hanging fruit. A couple of issue – we don't have an Umbrella ES department (AMCS, CALS, NAMS) - something SSU should consider.

Mike Ezra: We (ETHNIC STUDIES) "can't mount that many classes" only because we are resource deprived and have been for a long time. We've been over that. We are not merging the AMCS/CALS/NAMS departments. Stacey you are wrong. Asian American Studies classes would be housed in AMCS, courses are cross-linked. (pulled from Chat) Mike mentioned that it might be worth having EPC discuss possible relationships.

Stacey: Timeline of EO – revised EO to come from CO in mid-October. If SSU wants to push back, we should do this sooner than later, don't wait for revision EO

Melinda: asked Mike Ezra if the ES faculty are interested in the EPC response?

Mike: Ethnic students has tried to create an interdisciplinary department with CAMs, AMC, CALs, NAMS. Faculty in ES have always been opened to have another faculty teach ES. The proposed EO would limit faculty to ES.

Emily: voiced concern that units would be coming out of AREA D to ES which would impact School of Social Science

Mike: The upside is that resources would shift into ES which they have not previously been able to get. ES was disheartened to hear only lower division so happy UD will be included. Ethnic Studies faculty hold the position that only they can only teach ES courses. So this poses the question who is going to teach AREA F for SSU. Mike feels there are plenty of faculty outside of ES to teach ES. There is a large GE ARTH course in ES who according to Mike, the faculty is not qualified to be teaching the course. There is going to be a huge bottleneck for area F on our campus with the current plan. ES is willing to follow CO recommendations and other program will have to justify their ability to offer ES.

Sheri: what is being done with regard to overlays and CRS?

Emily: we are waiting to see what the EO is going to say before we move forward. Trying to pull through courses that are already in the pipeline to allow them to be offered in the Spring. Possibly pushing back "sundowning" course so we can offer them in the Spring as well.

The challenge for the overlay committee is if there is a new AREA F then how do they proceed with CRS in our new GE curriculum pattern. We need to push out our deadline for implementation so the overlay committee can wait to see what the final decision at the CO will be. Likely CRS will be AREA F vs an overlay. So maybe EPC needs to ask the overlay committee not to work on CRS at this time and focus their time on WIC. Need to come up with solution for pushing out the Sunset course that are in a GE area and CRS. Proposal needs to be developed for pushing out deadlines while we wait for CO.

Emily: Asks if having the Ethnic Studies prefix required – who is this going to affect in the pipeline for course approval in CRS, other program in the University that currently have ES course proposal or existing course.

Melinda: The ES will be a new requirement for 2021 but we still need to teach out the current students based on the old GE requirements, are we going to be able to implement AREA F while doing this. WGS and Sociology have CRS courses— maybe designation is still ok since we will need to graduate the current students under old GE pattern. We need to send a clear message to Departments of GE courses and how they link to ES – so they understand the deadlines and how things are going to be pushed out.

Emily reports that she and Stacey are working on a document with timeline.

Melinda: What is the impact on GE Subcommittee – how to prioritize what is moved through first. GE Subcommittee reports that they are only able to review about 70 courses per semester (or was this per year?).

Emily: We need to understand the prioritization – memo requested by academic program from departments regarding their plans for GE changes in their program, some departments have not responded so we don't have adequate information.

Melinda: Suggests that the Academic Program's Memo be sent explicitly asking departments what their plans are for GE, suggestion made that maybe combining efforts with Stacy and Jenn to get this information from departments.

Mike: Asked if we thought there was any chance SSU will skip overlay of CRS and just go to AREA F?

Melinda: In answer to Mikes questions: yes this is very likely. Then the question of whether SSU wants an additional requirement that meets the CRS expectations which is more comprehensive than ES.

Emily: CRS for upper division and ethnic studies should be ok since CO allowing UD.

Mike: We need cooperation of ES department to develop an intradisciplinary introductory course in Ethnic studies in order to have the ability to mount enough course to meet the current need. Discussion around having an Adjunct pool to help with this consisting of faculty approved to teach ES.

Kristen: suggest black and brown faculty hired to teach ES course

Mike: yes that is what we would like in ES, but there is a hiring freeze. All departments would like diverse hires.

Melinda: could you have faculty "affiliate" with ES –

Mike: great idea, solves gate keeper issue, not approving faculty, approving courses.

Melinda: should there be more hiring in this area. Sociology has hired faculty specifically to teach CRS and now with this new order they may not be able to teach in ES unless they could become ES faculty as well.

Mike: realizes that being a faculty in ES is simply where you were hired not necessarily more qualified.

Stacey: the goal is to have the most qualified people teaching these courses. Resources to ES is important, but we need to remember that resources are also being taken from other places. Brainstorming for more ideas is so important.

Mike: The departments won't have any motivation to have CRS course if the FTES is going to ES.

Stacey: Ideally the goal should be for faculty to be teaching the courses they want to teach and teach what you are good at teaching (and qualified to teach). Deans on the other hand need to watch for FTESs so this may be a barrier to faculty teaching what they want.

Mike: how do we deal with FTES

Stacey: affiliations and buying out faculty from other departments to teach CRS. Question is this really the meaning of the resource allocation to ES. We need to follow the "law", Deans may not allow faculty to teach the courses.

Kaitlin: Concerned about the delay of the overlay. What is the timeline for implementing AREA F?

Stacey: no official deadline due to a lot of push back.

Kaitlin: concerned about delaying overlays and courses for Area F while we wait. Feeling we need to move forward through the approval process for these course – then figure out a streamline process for moving to Area F

Emily: Reports Academic Senate of CSU proposed core competencies for ES in response to California Education Code 89032C. These are located in the share drive for EPC in the 3438.docx

Stacey: not sure if we want to follow those competencies

Mike Ezra: there is a working group for AREA F with chair across CSU – Mike feels that there might be push back from ES studies faculty to have intradisciplinary faculty. Mike asks the question, what would be the loss of seats if there is pushback? Thought is that the risk of losing up to 500 ES seats if we don't have interdisciplinary offerings.

Melinda: I think there is still room for these courses to continue to help graduate current students. Mapping this out will be difficult. Still teaching out the old GE with UDGE Area E. Could we just use the core competencies or would we want to add-on. Area F could be looked at in Spring if going to be implemented in Fall 2021, but if getting pushed back then we have more time. Kaitlin has a good point that maybe we should continue to approve ES course that aren't area F to continue to add to ES where we need seats.

Emily: forums from last spring brought a lot of info regarding CRS

Stacey: Big concern for spring – SSU is severely short on A1 seats. A1 has been in FLCs historically. We have 600+ sophomores who need A1 in addition to Freshman, Juniors and Seniors. There are not enough A1 courses approved yet. We need to quickly get additional A1 courses approved. Could we quickly approve A1 courses and then go back for a full review vs. allowing A1 courses to cut in line and be fully approved so they could be offered in Spring. Several courses coming. Social Studies has course that would help with FTES in area D.

Melinda: feels "cutting in line" would be fine. Also question of whether we are asking departments to mount new A1. Why don't we just increase the number of courses approved

Answer from member was A&H doesn't want to mount all the GE courses for A1 and other departments would like to have the option to offer some of these courses.

Stacey: Asking Departments for new A1 offering would be courses that exist but don't have the A1 tag yet

Melinda: It makes sense to fast-track these courses.

Emily: GE Subcommittee is very backlogged with all the new GE courses

Melinda: I was talking about existing course that could become A1 course – fast track those.

Stacy said: An analysis is going through courses that exist to identify those that could move to A1 area, and likely be quickly tagged as A1.

Emily concluded meeting at 12:02

2. Overlays – Melinda Milligan

3. Extension of Spring policy on CR/NC and late Withdrawals (See google drive)

4. Field Trip Policy (information dissemination)

Old Business Items

1. Finish up Curriculog Forms (November)

New Business Items

1. ArtH 432, ArtH 440, ArtH 442, ArtH 444, ArtH 465, ArtH 466, ArtH467, ArtH 468, ArtH 493, ArtH 494
- 2.
3. TC 10:15 Letha Chen (2nd reading, new information in comments of Curriculog) ArtH 490 (1st reading, see Curriculog). This is a second reading. Emily posed questioned if we had any questions about the proposals.

Committee is reviewing Emily's comments related to Art Departments online policy. Emily emphasized that she got this information from the Department.

They can take more units online which is help to expedite graduation, online is more accessible, they have notice greater number of disabled students.

Melissa was happy to hear that online is so successful. Melissa was asking about the online policy and who to decide what is appropriate to offer online.

Letha: The Art Department needs more time to craft a policy that makes sense for both the studio art along with Art history courses.

Melissa is thinking this is cart before the horse – to recommend all these online courses before having a policy, EPC would encourage you to move forward with a policy.

Letha says it is on the agenda and they are committed to creating a policy that supports their online course. The hope is to craft a policy to allow for courses both online or in person to best meet the needs of the students.

Melissa: recommends a policy in place by Fall 2021

Letha: Department is up for accreditation in 2021 so want to have this in place.

Melissa: WASC has particular restrictions on what percentage of program can be onlinr

Letha: Most faculty want to continue in person classes but this would open up options.

Emily: All the dates were updated for implementation

Emily would like to request that we have the first reading of

Motion to waive first reading of ARTH 490 motion by Melinda, second by Matty. Passed unanimously.

Melinda: Move to approve all Art History courses, second by Kristen. Approved

4. TC 11:00 (Alexis Boutin) (1st reading See Curriculog)

Kristen is asking about the various policies we have been working on. Have we notified departments about the need for online policy?

Matty reports that he polled the chairs of SST and the only department that currently has a policy is Nursing and Kinesiology is following the University policy.

Melinda states that we just need to know if they are in the process of developing a policy or following the University policy. Important for department to consider their own policy.

Jenn mentioned that it is important for department to have a policy stating which courses and why a course can be online.

Stacey coming later to talk about WASC and online policy.

Emily recommends that we put out the word that EPC is going to be working on a University policy and that Departments should start thinking about

Sheri agrees this adds clarity

Matty agrees re policy, but issue with chicken/egg. We don't want to write a policy in department that is contradictory to the University policy. I would assume University policy first then department react to that.

Melissa: reports that the departments were supposed to provide info related to policy and come back to EPC, but that did not happen. Important to determine who has policy and what impact with revising the University policy make. We collected who had the policy last year but out of date. University Curriculum Committee may need to collect this data.

Emily reports that more departments are doing policy because of the increase in online course due to pandemic. Emily has been gathering information from other university's about their online policy. The information is in a Google doc, please review when you have time to see what other schools are doing to think about what we want to do.

Emily: Philosophy minor revision has a unit change. Reducing major from 4 – 3 units. They don't have all the details and Jenn is trying to be proactive in Academic program and trying to troubleshoot what upcoming committees will be asking for as the program moves through the process. Emily is asking what EPC would like to see in this type of program change.

Melinda: asking if this is the

Jenn: two things, expeditied is rearranging, we were trying to fast track. They have 11 courses that are changing units and so their units are dropping due to GE changes. They do have a side by side for each course, but no program review included. All five concentrations side by side.

Melinda: Sounds like this could easily be remedied with referencing the program review and mentioned resources.

Jenn would send it forward and EPC could review. It is 11 courses, Jenn is worried because a lot of programs will be coming forward with this type of changes. More inclined to send them forward is just unit changes.

Kristen: So will every department in AH have to come through with program revision if we are just reducing units – looking at all areas.

Jenn: So if you have a program that has GE that are going from 4-3 units do we need to see an entire program revision or do we just need a side by side

Melinda is arguing that if they have just gone through a program revision, they would have all the data already and just need to point out the impact of the unit reduction.

Emily remarks that maybe having the programs reflect on this the program might find there is a greater impact that the unit change.

Melinda: is concerned if we streamline this process could be problematic. She feels impact can vary greatly by program, so important for programs to refer back to program reviews and consider this information.

Jenn: Program understand they have to change the unit requirement and don't have time for the rest i.e potential impact on pedagogy etc. She is happy to ask programs for this additional information if that is what EPC would like.

Emily: is asking if we want this information

Melinda: agree that it is important for Academic Program to ask the programs for what EPC is going to want. Jenn needs to be consistent in what she is asking programs so they are prepared when they come to EPC. Warn programs they might need to provide additional information when they get to EPC. Trying to avoid EPC asking for things they were not warned about.

Jenn is happy to ask programs to include their previous program review, Jenn can warn programs that we will want that but be able to move the proposals forward without including it at the time.

Emily: yesterday GE seats being held for first time freshman causing an issue in A1 and A3, which is causing a backlog of upper class students who need these courses. Deans are getting feedback on releasing these courses for the upper class student to take classes.

Melinda: clarifying if course should be released once the first time freshman get first pass. Or if the seats should be available to all from the start. Specifically the golden four.

Sheri asked: This is not for FLC courses

Melinda: how off track would ftf be if they could not take these courses enabling the upper class students to get these course. Melinda is wondering what the numbers are of upper class student that need these courses. Upper division should have priority in Spring so they can graduate. We need to ask Academic Program what is the best plan

Academic Programs is interpreting the need to prioritize upper class priority in Spring.

Kaitlin: mentioned inadequate number of courses in A1 and A3 and is suggesting a conversation about increasing the number of courses offered. Challenge since these courses are new to SSU.

Joe: asking about which courses are being restricted for the upper class.

Jenn: courses in A1 and A3, we definitely need more A1 seats.

Melinda: If there were no restriction and Junior and Seniors had priority and everyone else would fill in. Melinda feels there should be no restriction to promote graduation, but what is the impact of this. Maybe in spring there should be no restrictions unless Academic program feels this will create a bigger issue.

Jenn: 100+ Sophomore that need A1 so if restricted these students won't get in

Emily: lots of feedback, good ideas

Current Discussion Items

1. Online and hybrid academic year vs. summer teaching policies

On the Horizon

1. Hidden Pre-reqs and changing Pre-reqs
2. Discontinuance policy
3. Approval process for SEIE courses